

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/782,148	02/19/2004	Albert Wooi Quan Khor	70030623-1	5034
7:	590 07/15/2005		EXAM	INER
AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC.			PRASAD, CHANDRIKA	
Legal Department, DL429 Intellectual Property Administration			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. Box 7599 Loveland, CO 80537-0599			2839	
			DATE MAILED: 07/15/2004	•

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		M C				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summer	10/782,148	KHOR, ALBERT WOOI QUAN				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
The MAILING DATE of this communication and	Chandrika Prasad	2839				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ju 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pre					
Disposition of Claims						
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.	•				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). pjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	•					
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:					

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The reply filed on 6/20/05 consists of amendments to claims 1, 8, 18, change in the title and remarks related to rejection of claims. The claims are not allowable as explained below.

Specification

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The amended title is too general.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claim 1-4, 8-11 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Musk (5577146).

Musk (Figures 1-7) shows an optical fiber coupling system comprising an optical fiber receptacle adaptor 2 having a housing 3 with a receptacle end adapted to securing to an optical fiber receptacle 5 and for inserting therein and receiving an optical ferrule receiving portion of the optical fiber receptacle and a port end adapted for inserting therein an optical ferrule of plug 1 and urging the optical ferrule into communication with the optical ferrule receiving portion. The assembly has a locking module for

Art Unit: 2839

receiving and securing the free end of an optical ferrule of the optical fiber receptacle. The locking module comprises a first locking portion 31a and a second locking portion 31b defining a through-hole when assembled together and lockable to the adapter by formfitting locking mechanism. The receptacle has a flange portion and a collar portion. The locking portions are recessed for accommodating the collar portion and lockable to the adapter by a snap and clip mechanism. The method of assembling using steps of inserting and securing is inherent.

But Musk does not show the housing 3 as a single-part housing. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to make housing parts 3a, 3b as one integral housing 3 since it has been held that forming in one piece an article formerly made in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. Howard v. Detroit Stove Works, 150 US 164 (1893).

5. Claims 5-7 and 12-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Musk (5577146).

Musk shows all the features of these claims except slots in the receptacle end to engage protrusions on the locking portions. Musk shows slots in the locking portions to engage protrusions on the receptacle end wherein the slots and protrusions are essentially cylindrical shaped. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the instant invention to provide slots in the receptacle end to engage protrusions on the locking portions since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. In re Japiske, 86 USPQ 70.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 6/20/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Making in one piece an article formerly made in two pieces and put together involves only routine skill in the art. As to the arguments related to an active component 5 instead of having a receptacle end adapted for inserting therein and receiving an optical ferrule receiving portion and a port end adapted for inserting therein and receiving an optical ferrule, it should be pointed out that the claims do not positively claim these features. Claims simply recite the two ends adapted for doing some thing. The ends of the Musk's adaptor are adapted for doing certain things.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2839

Contact Information

8. Any correspondence to this action may be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents Post Office Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chandrika Prasad whose telephone number is (571) 272-2099.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor can be reached at (571) 272-2800 ext 39. The fax number is (703) 872-9306.

Chandrika Prasad Primary examiner July 14, 2005